

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JESSIE RAY TURNAGE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 22-C-624

FBI, LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT,
COOKS, MEDICS, and DOCTORS,

Defendants.

SCREENING ORDER

On May 26, 2022, Plaintiff Jessie Ray Turnage, proceeding *pro se*, brought this action against Defendants FBI, Local Law Enforcement, Cooks, Medics, and Doctors alleging that they took various actions in violation of his Constitutional rights. This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and for screening. For the following reasons, the case will be dismissed.

The Court is authorized to screen the complaint, regardless of a plaintiff's fee status, to "save everyone time and legal expense." *See Hoskins v. Poelstra*, 320 F.3d 761, 763 (7th Cir. 2003). In screening a complaint, the Court must determine whether the complaint complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and states at least plausible claims for which relief may be granted. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009); Fed. R. Civ. P. 8. To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, Plaintiff is required to provide a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It must be at least sufficient to provide notice to each defendant of what he or she is accused of doing, as well

as when and where the alleged actions or inactions occurred, and the nature and extent of any damage or injury the actions or inactions caused.

Plaintiff's complaint alleges that Defendants are spraying his food, water, and clothing with "harmful chemicals." Dkt. No. 1 at 2. He further alleges that Defendants have been "interfering" with his housing, medical treatment, and employment for the past two years, and that he has been getting "framed, sprayed, and tortured all day [and] night." *Id.* He asserts that this has happened to him in various cities and states across the United States and on various modes of transportation such as planes, trains, and buses. *Id.* As a result, Plaintiff seeks \$21,000,000 in damages.

This Court has "authority to dismiss frivolous or transparently defective suits spontaneously, and thus save everyone time and legal expense." *Hoskins*, 320 F.3d at 763. Allegations in a complaint are frivolous when they are clearly baseless, fanciful, fantastic, delusional, irrational, or wholly incredible. *Felton v. City of Chicago*, 827 F.3d 632, 635 (7th Cir. 2016). Plaintiff's allegations in this case are the "delusional" and "irrational" types of allegations that this Court is empowered to dismiss *sua sponte*. It is not plausible whatsoever that Defendants are following Plaintiff around the country, spraying his food, water, and clothing with harmful chemicals at all times of the day. *See, e.g., Leon v. United States Dep't of Def.*, No. 22-C-265, 2022 WL 1439034, at *2 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 28, 2022) ("Plaintiff alleges that various departments of the United States government, in conjunction with unnamed 'Hollywood elites,' are utilizing 'clone dusd,' 'EMP-Ghost,' and Bluetooth technology to connect to his brain and subject him to torture. These are the 'delusional' and 'irrational' types of allegations that the Court is empowered to dismiss *sua sponte*."); *Ash v. Wisconsin*, No. 21-cv-317-jdp, 2021 WL 3809912, at *2 (W.D. Wis. Aug. 26, 2021) ("Ash's allegations that she is attacked by radiation, surveilled by military

drones, followed everywhere, and has voices forcefully broadcast to her are irrational and implausible. These allegations cannot support a claim for relief.”).

Therefore, because Plaintiff’s allegations are delusional and irrational, this case will be dismissed as frivolous. Although it is usually necessary to permit a plaintiff the opportunity to file an amended complaint when a case is dismissed *sua sponte*, that is unnecessary when the amendment would be futile. *See Hukic v. Aurora Loan Servs.*, 588 F.3d 420, 432 (7th Cir. 2009).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case is dismissed as frivolous. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. No. 2) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 1st day of June, 2022.

s/ William C. Griesbach

William C. Griesbach
United States District Judge